



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Preventive Medicine

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ypmed

Building mutually beneficial partnerships to improve physical activity opportunities through shared-use efforts in under-resourced communities in Los Angeles County

Lindsey Burbage^a, Eloisa Gonzalez^b, Lauren Dunning^a, Paul Simon^{a,c}, Tony Kuo^{a,d,*}^a Division of Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, 3530 Wilshire Blvd, 8th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90010, USA^b Division of Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, 695 Vermont Avenue, 14th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90005, USA^c Department of Epidemiology, University of California, Los Angeles Jonathan and Karin Fielding School of Public Health, 71-254 CHS, Box 951772, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1772, USA^d Department of Family Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, 10880 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1800, Los Angeles, CA 90024-4142, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Available online 9 January 2014

Keywords:

Obesity
Physical activity
Schools
Community health planning
Legal liability
Shared-use efforts

ABSTRACT

Objective. To evaluate 18 shared-use agreements (SUAs) implemented in Los Angeles County during 2010–2012. SUAs opened school grounds and/or facilities in seven school districts to increase physical activity opportunities for under-resourced communities with high prevalence of obesity.

Methods. We reviewed the extent to which SUAs addressed school district concerns about *cost responsibility*, *sustainability*, and *scope*. A school site and community partner survey was conducted to inform planning and to facilitate comparisons of the types and range of legal clauses (up to 16) contained in the agreements. We used geographic information systems and 2010 United States Census data to estimate the population reached and the potential benefits of the SUAs.

Results. SUAs varied in the degree to which they addressed the three categories of concerns. Eight of the 18 agreements included 13 of the 16 legal clauses. We estimate that these SUAs have the potential to reach nearly 165,000 children (ages 5–19) and more than 500,000 adults (ages 20–64) at a cost of about \$0.38 per community member reached.

Conclusion. SUAs that include legal clauses to address school concerns about factors such as vandalism, staffing and funding represent a promising strategy for increasing physical activity opportunities in under-resourced neighborhoods where the prevalence of obesity is high.

© 2014 Elsevier Inc. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

Introduction

Obesity has reached elevated proportions in recent decades with prevalence estimates approaching 17% for children and 35% for adults in the United States (U.S.) (Ogden et al., 2012). Public health authorities are beginning to look for cost-effective ways to reduce this epidemic. Increased physical activity is a *candidate* strategy because of its numerous health benefits, including the potential to attenuate cardiovascular disease and diabetes risk (Kahn et al., 2002; Norman et al., 2006; Task

Force on Community Preventive Services (USTFPCS), 2001). Research has shown that there is a positive association between proximity to parks/recreational facilities and increased physical activity levels (Roemmich et al., 2006; Sallis et al., 2011). Programming and group activities, for example, have been found to be related to increased usage of school facilities and improved levels of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (Lafleur et al., 2013). Having convenient, reliable access to open space/recreational areas or programming that encourages physical activity, however, can be challenging, especially for under-resourced communities (Marie, 2007; Powell et al., 2006; Spengler et al., 2007).

Shared-use agreements (SUAs) where school property (i.e., the grounds, facilities, or both) and programming are shared between schools and community-based entities represent a strategy to address this public health problem. A *shared-use agreement* outlines an agreement between two or more parties that details and enumerates each party's responsibilities in the partnership. Shared-use encompasses a diverse array of agreement types, including joint-use agreements (JUA) and Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs). These contractual documents may be legally binding or non-binding; but whether or not they are legally binding does not diminish their potential benefits. A

Abbreviations: SUA, shared-use agreement; LAC, Los Angeles County; CPPW, Communities Putting Prevention to Work; CDC, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; ARRA, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; RENEW, *Renew Environments for Nutrition, Exercise and Wellness in LA County* initiative; JUMPP, *Joint Use Moving People to Play* Task Force; MOU, Memorandum of Understanding; GIS, geographic information systems.

* Corresponding author at: Division of Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, 3530 Wilshire Blvd, 8th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90010, USA. Fax: +1 213 351 2713.

E-mail addresses: lburbage@ph.lacounty.gov (L. Burbage), elgonzalez@ph.lacounty.gov (E. Gonzalez), ldunning@ph.lacounty.gov (L. Dunning), psimon@ph.lacounty.gov (P. Simon), tkuo@ph.lacounty.gov (T. Kuo).

formal agreement adds value to each partnership by laying out the expectations of the entering parties, reducing the odds that the relationship would dissolve prematurely.

School grounds offer clean, protected, and often underutilized space that community members can use for physical activity (Maddock et al., 2008). Communities that seek to promote physical activity and improve access to recreational space can partner with school districts. Non-profit organizations are also important partners as they often receive outside funding to provide programming (Lafleur et al., 2013).

SUAs offer the opportunity for both parties to clarify their intent and roles in the partnership, as well as to identify their individual interests. Even when state laws generally provide schools strong protection against liability for injuries to recreational users of school properties (California Tort Claims Act, 2012), the perceived threat of tort liability remains an important deterrent to schools' decisions to participate (Spengler et al., 2007; Zimmerman et al., 2013). A potential strategy for overcoming this barrier is the usage of comprehensive agreements that can address concerns about costs, liability, and authorized activities. SUAs that address a range of issues help create confidence for the parties in the agreement, fostering the conditions necessary for successful sharing of resources while reducing the likelihood of termination (ChangeLab Solutions, 2009a; Zimmerman et al., 2013).

Community-based active living strategies (e.g., healthy eating and physical activity promotion) represent priorities for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). In the *Communities Putting Prevention to Work* (CPPW) program, for example, the local arm in Los Angeles County (LAC) – the *Renew Environments for Nutrition, Exercise and Wellness in LA County* initiative (RENEW) – focused on addressing three primary objectives: 1) improving the built environment; 2) increasing access to healthy foods; and 3) decreasing sedentary behaviors through system and environmental change (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010; Bunnell et al., 2012). To address the third objective, RENEW supported several key school-based programs from 2010 to 2012. Among them, the *Joint-Use Moving People to Play* (JUMPP) Task Force initiated and completed several SUAs in under-resourced communities with high prevalence of child and adult obesity.

Although interest in SUAs is growing, much remains unknown about the processes required to construct and effectively implement them. Few studies have addressed physical activity-related SUAs, and even fewer have taken an in-depth look at the legal components that can

foster a mutually beneficial partnership (ChangeLab Solutions, 2009a). In the present article, we contribute to this gap in public health practice by reviewing 18 SUAs signed and implemented in LAC. Where appropriate, we used mixed methods to describe the JUMPP effort, estimate the population reached by the SUA interventions, and examine the benefits of investing in shared-use strategies. Although the concerns of both parties in the agreement are important, the present study centered only on the interests of the school districts, the entities that have the greatest perceived risk of liability and costs (ChangeLab Solutions, 2009a, 2009b; National Policy and Legal Analysis Network to Prevent Childhood Obesity (NPLAN), 2010).

Methods

Construction of shared-use agreements

In 2010, with support from RENEW and guidance on the SUA process from the JUMPP Task Force (Table 1), school districts were identified and selected according to their childhood obesity prevalence (Office of Health Assessment and Epidemiology, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, 2011), with the highest receiving priority. The first seven eligible districts that provided RENEW with letters of commitment signed by their superintendents were recruited; the final list of districts included: ABC Unified, Compton Unified, El Monte City, Pomona Unified, Mountain View, Pasadena Unified, and the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Upon selection, a review of each district's schools and their physical activity-related programming was conducted. Trained observers conducted school site observations after shared-use agreements were implemented. All 7 districts had disproportionately high child and adult obesity rates, and all had executed a shared-use agreement between schools and community or government entities from January 2010 through December 2012. Following this review, an online school site and community partner survey was sent out to key representatives from each of the school districts (for one of the districts, two representatives were asked to participate). Findings from this school site and community partner survey were used to create a framework from which to analyze and compare the completed JUMPP-assisted SUAs. When appropriate, potential reach and selected costs were estimated for the SUAs to provide context on the benefits of this obesity prevention strategy.

Nearly all of the selected school sites in the JUMPP initiative were located in neighborhoods with higher obesity prevalence, lower income, and less open space than the average community in the county. As of 2008, the childhood obesity prevalence in the selected districts was above the county average (22.0%), ranging from 24.4% to 33.6% (Office of Health Assessment and Epidemiology, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, 2011). Student

Table 1

The model process used by the JUMPP Task Force to help develop, adopt and implement shared-use agreements in Los Angeles County, 2010–12.^a

| Phase I Community assessment | Phase II Develop shared-use strategy | Phase III Coalition building/broadening | Phase IV Implementation | Phase V Strategy oversight |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Step 1. Identify and document local problems and issues. > Step 2. Examine the geo-social environment. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Step 1. Develop goals for the shared-use agreement(s). > Step 2. Consider organizational resources. > Step 3. Identify constituents, allies and opponents. > Step 4. Identify key decision-makers to inform. > Step 5. Provide technical assistance, as needed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Step 1. Build/broaden coalition(s) in support of the shared-use agreement(s). > Step 2. Refine and utilize coalition approaches to informing and educating decision-makers. > Step 3. Create and assemble a shared-use tool kit for use by participant school districts and/or community groups. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Step 1. Implement coalition building strategies, employing the shared-use tool kit and other tools. > Step 2. Negotiate terms of shared-use agreement(s) and prepare for signature. > Step 3. Execute the agreement(s). > Step 4. Implement the different elements or provisions contained in the agreement(s). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Step 1. Raise public awareness about the agreement(s) and their potential benefits. > Step 2. Monitor use of school grounds/facilities as per executed agreement(s). > Step 3. Periodically assess and address any needs for amending the executed agreement(s). > Step 4. Negotiate any necessary amendments to the agreement(s) with governing or responsible party(-ies). > Step 5. Execute the amendment (s), as needed. |

^a Although the JUMPP Task Force used the model process to assist with several shared-use agreements, not all agreements required all phases or steps of the process. In each case, the model process was tailored to the stage of readiness and preparation for each school district and the community.

demographics for each of the selected district were believed to be representative of the community at large and specifically, of the community members (children and families) most likely to use the opened school grounds and/or facilities as a result of the SUAs (Table 2).

To facilitate physical activity-specific SUAs, the JUMPP Task Force began its efforts by first assessing the school districts' receptiveness towards opening their space/facilities to the adjacent communities. The school site and community partner survey was an online survey of school district key informants. It was sent to one or two stakeholders engaged in each site-specific SUA adopted and implemented under RENEW. Survey recipients were encouraged to speak with colleagues engaged in the shared-use (joint-use) work to capture their input in the survey responses. Survey items were developed by DPH staff, in collaboration with staff from the Sarah Samuels Center for Public Health Research & Evaluation and from the Los Angeles County Office of Education, as no previously validated items were identified in the literature at the time the survey was fielded. The survey was conducted between June and August 2011. The survey's thirteen items specifically assessed: respondent's role in the site specific shared-use agreement at their school, implementation challenges, types of participants observed utilizing school sites during the shared-use period, perceptions of how the SUA impacted community physical activity levels and relationship with the school site, resources needed in order to continue to implement the SUA at the school/make it more sustainable, and lessons learned/advice for others interested in implementing SUAs at school sites. Items were a combination of closed and open-ended questions. The response rate was 53% (10 out of 19). Through this survey, the Task Force assessed participating districts' views about the SUA process; the survey included questions about barriers facing each district and planned use for each of the SUAs. Results from the survey helped inform the Task Force about school districts' needs and concerns regarding the agreements. The Task Force applied these findings, along with other school information, to help characterize the types of legal clauses in the agreements, which addressed common issues such as cost-sharing, liability, and facility maintenance. The challenges addressed through the survey were concerns regarding: operations/maintenance, liability, staffing, vandalism, budget, and safety. This information provided a framework from which to expand upon and to identify additional barriers that may face school districts in establishing a sustainable partnership through a SUA.

From 2010 to 2012, the JUMPP Task Force facilitated 18 SUAs in the seven school districts. These 18 SUAs included programmatic and open-gate agreements and varied in terms of duration, scope and codified arrangements with the community. Although a few of the agreements were initiated prior to the start of RENEW, most were started and completed with JUMPP Task Force support (i.e., JUMPP provided staffing, technical assistance, or both). The

shared-use framework of JUMPP allowed selected districts the flexibility to use a variety of existing mechanisms (e.g., civic center permit, space lease agreement, Memorandum of Understanding [MOU], and other formalized agreements) to implement arrangements that mutually benefited each school and the community partner(s). For the purposes of this article, all 18 JUMPP-assisted agreements were grouped under the general category of "SUAs", as long as they provided the desired outcome of increasing community access to school property for physical activity, with a focus on children and adults, regardless of legal status.

Analysis of completed shared-use agreements

To be included in the analysis, JUMPP-assisted SUAs must have been executed by the end of March 2012. Using the challenges listed in the school site and community partner survey as a baseline (operations/maintenance, liability, staffing, vandalism, budget, and safety), we developed a framework from which to evaluate the completed SUAs. Vandalism was incorporated under the safety clause, since it seems to encompass the concerns covered by the clause. The remaining clauses came from reviewing tools provided by other organizations that have conducted extensive research on shared-use documents (ChangeLab Solutions, 2009a; Vincent and Cooper, 2008). Clauses that overlapped the model agreements provided by ChangeLab Solutions and were identified as important in other shared-use partnership tools were included in the evaluation. These common clauses (SUAs) fell naturally into three overarching categories: *cost responsibility*, *sustainability*, and *scope*. The *cost responsibility* category included such contractual elements as each party's responsibilities for liability/indemnity, insurance, security, and restitution/repairs. Elements such as sanitation, other facility maintenance responsibilities, and state/local law compliance fell under the *sustainability* category. Finally, elements that defined the range of program services to be provided, specific spaces/facilities to be utilized, and use periods of the school grounds/facilities were grouped under the *scope* category. Agreements were also analyzed by type of mechanism used and whether the SUA included programmatic and/or open-gate elements.

To provide supplemental context to the 18 SUA reviews, we calculated the potential number of residents reached by each agreement intervention, using geographic information systems (GIS) and the 2010 Census data (U.S. Census, 2010). Mapping of the 49 SUA school locations, for example, was carried out using a 1-mile buffer placed around each of the shared-use school sites with the assumption that community members may travel up to 1 mile to use the open space or facilities. When reviewing the literature, we found a lack of consensus on an acceptable distance that people are willing to travel to for

Table 2
Student characteristics of school districts with JUMPP-assisted shared-use agreements in Los Angeles County, school year 2010–11.

| | ABC Unified School District (n = 20,682) | Pasadena Unified School District (n = 19,803) | Mountain View School District (n = 8021) | El Monte City School District (n = 9534) | Los Angeles Unified School District (n = 667,251) | Compton Unified School District (n = 24,221) | Pomona Unified School District (n = 28,295) | All selected school districts in Los Angeles County (n = 1,589,390) |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| <i>Race/ethnicity</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 42.1% | 59.2% | 93.2% | 78.4% | 73.4% | 78.0% | 82.5% | 63.7% |
| Black | 9.8% | 17.3% | 0.1% | 0.3% | 9.9% | 16.6% | 5.9% | 8.8% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 37.9% | 5.0% | 5.8% | 18.0% | 6.5% | 0.6% | 5.8% | 10.4% |
| Caucasian | 7.8% | 14.3% | 0.6% | 2.9% | 8.8% | 0.2% | 4.5% | 14.8% |
| Other ^a | 2.3% | 3.2% | 0.2% | 0.4% | 0.5% | 0.2% | 1.2% | 1.1% |
| <i>Prevalence of childhood overweight and obesity in the community</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Overweight ^b | 18.8% | 19.4% | 21.3% | 22.3% | 20.4% | 21.1% | 19.9% | 19.1% |
| Obese ^b | 18.7% (Hawaiian Gardens – 29.5%) | 24.4% | 33.6% | 30.1% | 25.9% | 29.1% | 28.0% | 22.4% |

^a Category includes mixed race, American Indian, and/or Alaska Native (not Hispanic).

^b Notes: Estimates of overweight and obesity are based on objectively measured height and weight (calculated body mass index or BMI) collected annually as part of the California Physical Fitness Testing Program (FITNESSGRAM®). These data are collected on ~300,000 students in grades 5, 7, and 9 annually in California public schools. Fitness and body composition are also assessed on these students annually.

All schools in these districts are physically located in the county of Los Angeles.

Childhood overweight was defined as having a gender-specific BMI-for-age ≥ 85th and <95th percentiles using the 2000 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Growth Charts.

Childhood obesity was defined as having a gender-specific BMI-for-age at or above the 95th percentile using the 2000 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Growth Charts.

Overweight and obesity prevalence estimates were calculated using a modified data cleaning algorithm.

recreation, ranging from 1/8th of a mile to 1 mile (Harnik and Simms, 2004). Although we believe people are not likely to walk more than 1/2 mile to a park or recreation space, given the commuter culture of LAC and the lack of recreational facilities in the targeted communities, we believe 1 mile is an acceptable distance for people to travel. Population in the surrounding community was estimated for each of the census tracts within the 1-mile radius (buffer region), assuming uniform population numbers throughout the census tract. When appropriate, we calculated a ratio of CPPW funds invested to community members reached, based on the total expenditures or investments made by the JUMPP Task Force to construct and implement SUAs across the seven school districts. DPH's institutional review board reviewed and approved all study protocols, procedures, and materials prior to fieldwork.

Results

Eighteen SUAs met the criteria for inclusion (JUMPP-assisted, physical activity-related, focus on children and adults). Of the eight school representatives that completed the school site and community partner survey, approximately half (50%) reported safety, vandalism, and staffing as their top concerns. A little over one-third (37.5%) considered operational/maintenance issues as a challenge. Approximately 62.5% indicated that their school district would be amendable to opening outdoor school facilities for community use outside of regular school hours; about half would work with third parties (e.g., sports leagues, government agencies, and community organizations) to operate programs (e.g., walking clubs, swimming lessons, and Zumba®/fitness classes) outside of the regular school hours (Table 3).

In total, there were 16 legal clauses identified under the three overarching categories: *cost responsibility* (5 clauses), *sustainability* (7 clauses), and *scope* (4 clauses). Under the *scope* category, nearly all of the SUAs ($n = 17$ agreements) included all of the provisions; one SUA failed to directly address use period. The clauses contained within the other two categories, *cost responsibility* and *sustainability* were not as consistently represented. Although the clauses on indemnity ($n = 12$ agreements), insurance ($n = 13$), restitution/repairs ($n = 12$), and liability ($n = 13$) were included in a majority of the agreements, security was addressed only in less than half of the JUMPP-assisted SUAs ($n = 7$). Similarly, while clauses in the *sustainability* category such as state/local law compliance ($n = 18$ agreements), communication protocol ($n = 11$), and operations/maintenance ($n = 13$) were included in the majority (Table 4), other *sustainability* clauses such as sanitation ($n = 9$), severability ($n = 9$), and transferability ($n = 7$) were only represented in half or less than half of the agreements (Table 4).

Among the 18 SUAs, the type of agreement appeared to be related to the number and type of clauses that were incorporated as part of each of the three overarching categories. *Agreements for Services/Shared-use Agreements* and *License Agreements* contained the highest number of clauses (mean = 15.1 clauses) while *Community Recreation Agreements* (mean = 6.7 clauses) and *Letter of Agreements* (mean = 7.0 clauses) contained the fewest.

Supplemental context

In supplemental analysis, the 18 JUMPP-assisted SUAs were estimated to have the potential to reach approximately 29,035 children (ages 5–19) and 89,155 adults (ages 20–64) in the surrounding communities. This estimate was calculated using the census tracts that were included in the 1-mile radius of the school sites and assumed 10% of the population may participate. The estimate represented the potential reach count of people that could potentially participate. Although it has a number of limitations, reach estimates are often used by funding agencies such as the CDC to help plan and make decisions about resource allocations (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012). Based on a total of \$281,515 invested in the JUMPP Task Force effort, it was estimated that approximately 4 community members were reached for every \$10 spent during the CPPW-RENEW program

(\$0.38 per member reached); these cost projections, however, did not account for the programming (if offered) or each school site's costs of maintaining the opened space/facilities.

Discussion

Many of the concerns noted by the school districts were addressed by the elements found in the SUAs. However legal clauses related to security were surprisingly not as common as expected based on school concerns. This lack of inclusion may affect the continuation of each agreement over time. Given the importance of sanitation and facility maintenance services to a school, it was also surprising that these operational issues were not addressed in writing in more of the school–community arrangements. Omission of these clauses or lack of their inclusion may be due to the nature, duration and circumstances surrounding each agreement. Standardized legal analysis of SUAs and technical assistance, as well as tools provided by such organizations as ChangeLab Solutions, could help mitigate these and other overlooked issues during the construction of a shared-use agreement (ChangeLab Solutions, 2009a). Collectively, the benefits of working with the JUMPP Task Force were evident by the higher number of school districts that instituted a programmatic element in their contractual arrangements (more than were originally planned) and the emphasis that the JUMPP-assisted SUAs had adult-oriented programming (Table 4). The programmatic inclusion had previously been shown to be associated with greater usage of the opened space or facilities by community members (Lafleur et al., 2013).

Many of the costs related to SUA implementation were not enumerated in this present review due to limited information on expenses incurred by the school districts and the local organizations themselves. Accounting for these additional expenditures, the ratio of CPPW funds invested-to-community members reached would increase. Further research and economic evaluations are clearly needed to study this important subject matter, including: more comprehensive legal classification of SUA types; costs incurred by school districts and individual schools while participating in these efforts; and whether SUAs increased net physical activity among community members.

Conclusions

With declining budgets and resources in many jurisdictions, SUAs and the partnerships they support may offer important opportunities for cities and/or communities to promote physical activity at relatively lower cost as compared to other strategies, maximizing existing community assets when possible. The achievements of the JUMPP Task Force during 2010–2012 represent emerging models of SUA design and practice that can be replicated and potentially used to guide future shared-use efforts in other communities across the United States.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors report no financial disclosures or conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Aida Angelescu, Janice Casil, and Douglas Morales in the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health for their technical assistance with GIS mapping. In addition, the authors would like to thank Mikaela Randolph from RENEW LA County for her programmatic contributions; Dr. Joanie Verderber and Marie Crosby from the Los Angeles County Office of Education for their support; the Sarah Samuels Center for Public Health Research & Evaluation for their technical assistance on the JUMPP Task Force school site and community partner survey; and Janice Vick and Kathleen Whitten from ICF International for their careful review of the manuscript prior to submission.

Table 3
Facilitators and barriers to establishing shared-use agreements in Los Angeles County: results from a school site and community partner survey of eight school district representatives, 2010–11.^a

| | Percent (n) |
|---|-------------|
| <i>Facilitators (organizational readiness to...)</i> | |
| Open outdoor school facilities to community use outside of regular school hours. | 62.5% (5) |
| Open indoor school facilities to community use outside of regular school hours. | 25.0% (2) |
| Encourage third party use ^b of indoor and/or outdoor school facilities to operate programs outside of regular school hours for community members and students. | 50.0% (4) |
| Engage in reciprocal shared-use of district and city recreation facilities. | 37.5% (3) |
| <i>Concerns/barriers to establishing shared-use agreements</i> | |
| Concerns about operations and/or maintenance. | 37.5% (3) |
| Concerns about liability risks. | 50% (4) |
| Concerns about safety for community members and/or students. | 50% (4) |
| Concerns about vandalism. | 50% (4) |
| Concerns about budget constraints. | 75.0% (6) |
| Concerns about staffing, including janitorial staff. | 50% (4) |
| Other concerns (none of the above). | 25.0% (2) |

^a All participants (school district representatives) of the school site and community partner survey were asked to *check all that apply* on questions about facility locations, concerns, and perceived barriers to establishing a shared-use agreement. The Sarah Samuels Center for Public Health Research & Evaluation was contracted to conduct the online school site and community partner survey with guidance from the JUMPP Task Force. There were eight total participants (one representative from each of 6 school districts, and 2 from one of the larger districts).

^b Example: sports leagues, government agencies, and/or community organizations.

The project was supported in part by a cooperative agreement from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (#3U58DP002485-01S1) and by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Public Health Law Research Program (#70512). The findings and conclusions in the article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views or the official position(s) of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) or any other organization mentioned in the text. Users of this document should be aware that every funding source has different requirements governing the appropriate use of funding. Under U.S. law, no Federal funds are permitted to be used for lobbying or to influence,

directly or indirectly, specific pieces of pending or proposed legislation at the federal, state, or local level. Organizations should consult appropriate legal counsel to ensure compliance with all rules, regulations, and restriction of any funding sources. The CDC invited authors to submit this article for the CDC-sponsored supplement through a contract with ICF International (Contract No. 200-2007-22643-0003). Through this contract, the contracted firm supported staff training and review by scientific writers for the development of the paper. Staff at the CDC has reviewed the article for design and data collection methodology, and for scientific accuracy. All authors have read and approved the final version.

Table 4
Common legal clauses found in shared-use agreements: comparison of 18 JUMPP-assisted agreements implemented in seven school districts (49 school sites) in Los Angeles County, organized by agreement type, 2010–2012.

| | 1 ^a | 2 ^a | 3 ^a | 4 ^a | 5 ^a | 6 ^a | 7 ^b | 8 ^b | 9 ^c | 10 ^c | 11 ^c | 12 ^d | 13 ^d | 14 ^e | 15 ^e | 16 ^e | 17 ^f | 18 ^g | Percent (n) |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| <i>Cost responsibility clauses</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Liability/indemnity | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 83.3% (15) |
| Insurance/risk management | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 72.2% (13) |
| Security protocol | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | 38.9% (7) |
| Restitution/repairs | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | 66.7% (12) |
| <i>Sustainability clauses</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanitation | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | | 50.0% (9) |
| Termination/default | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | 55.5% (10) |
| Severability | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | 50.0% (9) |
| Transferability | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | 38.9% (7) |
| State/local law compliance | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 100% (18) |
| Communication protocol | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 61.1% (11) |
| Maintenance | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | 72.2% (13) |
| <i>Scope clauses</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Included area(s) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 100% (18) |
| Term/duration | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 100% (18) |
| Programs/services materials/equipment | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 100% (18) |
| Use period | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 94.4% (17) |

^a Agreement for Services/Shared-use Agreement.

^b License Agreement.

^c Community Recreation Agreement.

^d Memorandum of Understanding.

^e Application and Permit/Agreement for Use.

^f Contract.

^g Letter of Agreement.

References

- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Prevention and Wellness Initiative: Communities Putting Prevention to Work. Available: http://www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease/recovery/PDF/HHS_CPPW_CommunityFactSheet.pdf (Last accessed March 6, 2012).
- Bunnell, R., O'Neil, D., Soler, R., Payne, R., Giles, W.H., Collins, J., Bauer, U., 2012. Fifty Communities Putting Prevention to Work: accelerating chronic disease prevention through policy, systems and environmental change. *J. Community Health* 37 (5), 1081–1090.
- California Tort Claims Act, January 28, 2012. Government code section 815–818.9. Available: <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=gov&group=00001-01000&file=815-818.9> (Last accessed).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012. CTG program reach guidance (internal 169 document). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Atlanta, GA.
- Changelab Solutions, 2009a. Model joint use agreement resources increasing physical activity by opening up school grounds. Available: <http://changelabsolutions.org/publications/model-JUAs-CA> (Last accessed November 4, 2012).
- Changelab Solutions, 2009b. Checklist for developing a joint use agreement. Available: <http://changelabsolutions.org/publications/checklist-developing-joint-use-agreement-jua> (Last accessed October 1, 2013).
- Maddock, J., Choy, L.B., Nett, B., McGurk, M.D., Tamashiro, R., 2008. Increasing access to places for physical activity through a joint use agreement: a case study in urban Honolulu. *Prev. Chro. Dis.* 5 (3), A91.
- Harnik, P., Simms, J., 2004. Parks: how far is too far. *Planning* 70 (11), 8–11.
- Kahn, E.B., Ramsey, L.T., Brownson, R.C., Heath, G.W., Howze, E.H., Powell, K.E., Stone, E.J., Rajab, M.W., Phaedra, C., 2002. The effectiveness of interventions to increase physical activity: a systematic review. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 22 (4), 73–107.
- Lafleur, M., Gonzalez, E., Schwarte, L., Banthia, R., Kuo, T., Verderber, J., Simon, P., 2013. Increasing physical activity in under-resourced communities through school-based, joint-use agreements, Los Angeles County, 2010–2012. *Prev. Chro. Dis.* 10, E89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5888/pcd10.120270>.
- Marie, K.L., 2007. One plus one equals three: shared-use libraries in urban areas — the ultimate form of library cooperation. *Libr. Leadersh. Manag.* 21, 23–28.
- National Policy and Legal Analysis Network to Prevent Childhood Obesity (NPLAN), 2010. A look at state rules affecting shared-use agreements. N.P. Available: <http://www.nplanonline.org/nplan/products/community-use-charts> (Last Accessed November 4, 2012.).
- Norman, G.J., Nutter, S.K., Ryan, S., Sallis, J.F., Calfas, K.J., Patrick, K., 2006. Community design and access to recreational facilities as correlates of adolescent physical activity and body-mass index. *J. Phys. Act Health* 3, S118.
- Office of Health Assessment and Epidemiology, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, 2011. Obesity and related mortality in Los Angeles County: a cities and community health report. Available: http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/ha/reports/habriefs/2007/Obese_Cities/Obesity_2011Fs.pdf (Last assessed November 13, 2012).
- Ogden, C.L., Carroll, M.D., Kit, B.K., Flegal, K.M., 2012. Prevalence of obesity in the United States, 2009–2010. NCHS data brief, no 82. National Center for Health Statistics, Hyattsville, MD.
- Powell, L.M., Slater, S., Chaloupka, F.J., Harper, D., 2006. Availability of physical activity-related facilities and neighborhood demographic and socioeconomic characteristics: a national study. *Am. J. Public Health* 96 (9), 676–1680.
- Roemmich, J.N., Epstein, L.H., Raja, S., Li, Yind, Robinson, J., Winiewicz, D., 2006. Association of access to parks and recreational facilities with the physical activity of young children. *Prev. Med.* 43 (6), 437–441.
- Sallis, J.F., Millstein, R.A., Carlson, J.A., 2011. Community design for physical activity. In: Dannenberg, A.L., Frumkin, H., Jackson, R.J. (Eds.), *Making Healthy Places: Designing and Building for Health, Well-being, and Sustainability*. Island Press, pp. 33–49.
- Spengler, J.O., Young, S.J., Linton, L.S., 2007. Schools as a community resource for physical activity: legal considerations for decision makers. *Am. J. Health Promot.* 21 (4S), 390–396.
- Task Force on Community Preventive Services (USTFPCS), 2001. Increasing physical activity. A report on recommendations of the Task Force on Community Preventive Services. *MMWR Recomm. Rep.* 50, 1–14 (RR-18).
- U.S. Census, 2010. . Available: <http://www.census.gov/2010census/> (Last Accessed November 7, 2012.).
- Vincent, J.M., Cooper, T., 2008. Joint Use School Partnerships in California: strategies to enhance schools and communities. Available: UC Berkeley: Center for Cities and Schools (<http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/5qn6k7f4>).
- Zimmerman, S., Kramer, K., Trowbridge, M.J., 2013. Overcoming legal liability concerns for school-based physical activity promotion. *Am. J. Public Health* 103 (11), 1962–1968.